

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1–17 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1–17 have been cancelled, and new claims 18–33 have been added. Claims 18–33 are pending.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1–17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,234 to Shaffer et al. (“Shaffer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,903 to Rakoshitz et al. (“Rakoshitz”). Claims 1–17 are cancelled and this rejection is rendered moot.

New Claims 18–33

Each of claims 18–33 contain limitations not cited in Shaffer, Rakoshitz, or the other cited art of record, and are therefore patentable. The following remarks are intended to aid in Examiner’s understanding of the newly presented claims in light of the art previously cited. These remarks address only the independent claims (18, 23, and 33). Because these independent claims are patentable over the prior art, claims depending therefrom are necessarily patentable.

Shaffer discloses a multipoint control unit coordinator (MCUC) that tracks all conferences in a telecommunications system. The MCUC maintains a database of all the multipoint control units in the system, and determines the most appropriate mixing location for data processing when additional parties are added to a teleconference. Rakoshitz teaches a traffic monitoring method for monitoring and profiling of information flow in a network.

Claim 18 is drawn to a network server including: (1) a network management system configured to automatically and dynamically coordinate cascading of two or more multipoint control units; (2) a gateway configured to implement one or more network policies; and (3) a resource scheduler configured to perform one or more of (i) interact with calendars of others, (ii) send conference invitations to others, (iii) update the calendars of others on acceptance of an invitation, and (iv) communicate with the gatekeeper on receiving a conference request.

The Examiner previously conceded that Shaffer did not teach a resource scheduler as recited by the now cancelled claims. The resource scheduler recited in claim 18 includes further limitations to clarify the function of the resource scheduler, namely one or more of the functions (i)–(iv) recited above. The Examiner's argument that Rakoshitz teaches a resource scheduler is not persuasive in view of the resource scheduler recited in claim 12.

Rakoshitz discloses a FAIR module for receiving conference call requests. [Rakoshitz at col. 13, l. 57–col. 14, l. 5.] Rakoshitz' FAIR module only implements traffic control based on a combination of flow control and queuing algorithms. [*Id.* at col. 13, ll. 59–64.] FAIR's objective provides inbound and outbound traffic management, reducing the load on packet classifiers and packet schedulers. [*Id.* at col. 13, ll. 64–66.] This is more akin to the gatekeeper recited in claim 18, which implements network policies relating to, *inter alia*, network bandwidth management (although Applicant does not concede that the FAIR module meets the requirements of the gatekeeper limitation of claim 18). Nowhere does Rakoshitz teach or suggest a resource scheduler that can, for example, interact with the calendars of others on the enterprise network, send conference invitations, or update participant calendars as recited by claim 18.

Accordingly, the network server of claim 18 is not obvious in view of the cited references because the cited references together do not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. *See* MPEP § 2143.03.

Claim 23 is drawn to a method of scheduling a conference call including receiving a request to schedule a call, determining whether the call can be completed based on one or more network policies, and, if so, scheduling the call and transmitting invitations to the invitees. Neither Shaffer nor Rakoshitz, either separately or in combination, teaches nor suggests such a method.

Finally, claim 33 is drawn to a method of dynamically cascading multipoint control units comprising receiving notification that a call has been scheduled, determining whether dynamic cascading is required, and, if so, determining an optimum cascade configuration and directing devices to call into appropriate ports to optimize the network configuration.


Neither Shaffer nor Rakoshitz, either separately or in combination, teaches nor suggests such a method.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18-33 are in condition for allowance and requests that a notice of allowance issue for these claims.

* * * * *

Respectfully submitted,

October 27, 2005
Date


Billy C. Allen III
Reg. No. 46,147

CUSTOMER NO. 29855

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.,
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
Voice 832-446-2409
Fax 832-446-2424